REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In the subject Office Action, claims 17-26 have been rejected. In response, Applicant has amended claims 17, 19, 21, 23, and 25. Claims 1-16 and 27-29 have been allowed. Accordingly, claims 1-29 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112," item 1 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 23-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The Examiner states that claims 23-26 are not supported or enabled to operate. Specifically, the Examiner states that "independent claims 23 and 25 both detail the privilege remapper configured to remap a [CPL] using an instruction of the processor to a different [CPL], wherein the remapping is performed independent of the operating system, the instruction, and the task. It would be impossible for one to perform remapping by using an instruction . . . wherein the remapping is performed independent of the instruction that is invoked to perform the remapping."

In response, Applicant has amended claims 23 and 25 to clarify that the referenced instruction is an operating system instruction for storing the later-remapped CPL. Thus, as

9

amended, there is no contradiction in having the remapping performed independently of the instruction.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 23-26 are now in compliance with 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103," item 3 on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 17-22 have been rejected as being unpatentable over "Advanced Embedded X86 Programming: Protection and Segmentation," by Gareau (hereinafter "Gareau").

To overcome the Examiner's Rejection, Applicant has amended claims 17, 19, and 21 to recite that the remapping is being performed "independently of the operating system." Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 17, 19, and 21 are in condition for allowance. Claims 18, 20, and 22 depend from claims 17, 19, and 21, and thus are also in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

In item 4, page 4, the Examiner has allowed claims 1-16 and 27-29 and provided suggestions for amending claims 17-26 to put those claims in condition for allowance. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 1-16 and 27-29, and for the helpful suggestions regarding amendments to claims 17-26. Applicant has now made amendments such as those suggested by the Examiner. Thus Applicant asserts that claims 17-26 are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-29 are solicited. Applicant submits that claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: <u>November 21, 2006</u>   <u>/Robert C. Peck/</u>

Robert C. Peck
Reg. No. 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981